

Docket No.: 1614.1143D

Serial No. 10/762,276

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, independent claims 1, 3 and 4 have been amended to clarify a salient feature of the invention, claims 3-6 are amended to improve punctuation, as is claim 1 (in each instance, inserting - - , - - in the preamble preceding "comprising") and new claim 7/5 and 8/6 are presented, the latter setting forth amendatory recitations currently presented in independent claims 1 and 4.

No new matter is presented and, accordingly, approval and entry of the claim amendments and new claims are respectfully requested.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-6 as heretofore pending continue to be rejected.

In accordance with the foregoing amendments to the independent claims 1 and 4 and in accordance with the following comments, it is submitted that the pending and new claims patentably distinguish over the references and rejections of record and, accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-6 and allowance of all of the pending claims 1-8 are respectfully requested.

PAGE 6: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 2 FOR ANTICIPATION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) BY STUCKE (U.S. PATENT 5,335,146); AND

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3-6 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(A) OVER STUCKE IN VIEW OF DURSTON ET AL. (U.S. PATENT 6,154,373) AND DEBORD ET AL. (U.S. PATENT 6,932,617)

The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Relationship of Subject Application to Allowed (Parent) Application Serial No. 09/811,694, now U.S. Patent 6,690,584

In prosecution of the parent application, the references to Stucke and Tokishima were relied upon in combination under 35 U.S.C. §103 in the rejection of various claims of the parent application hereof. After amendments of various claims and argumentation in the parent prosecution, the rejections were deemed to have been overcome and the amended claims of the parent were allowed in accordance with the Notice of Allowance issued therein - - and, pursuant to which, the '584 patent issued on that parent application, as above noted.

Docket No.: 1614.1143D

Serial No. 10/762,276

Independent claims 1 and 4 of this divisional application have been amended to include recitations cited in the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance in Item 2 of the Notice of Allowance in the parent prosecution, mailed September 24, 2003. Accordingly, claims 1 and 4 herein are submitted to be allowable for the same reasons as claims were allowed in the parent application. Dependent claims 2 and 3 inherit the recitations, and thus patentable distinctions, of independent claim 1 and, accordingly, are allowable over Stucke, alone or in combination with the secondary references, for at least the same reasons as claim 1 herein.

Particularly as to the rejection of claim 1 for anticipation (along with its dependent claim 2/1), it is apparent that Stucke is incapable of supporting the anticipation rejection in view of the amendments to claim 1 hereinabove.

It follows as well that claim 2 necessarily is allowable over Stucke for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 3 likewise inherits the patentably distinguishing limitations of its independent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Amended claim 4 likewise patentably distinguishes for the reasons as set forth above, as regards claim 1.

DEPENDENT CLAIM 3/1 AND INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 5 AND 6

In the rejection of claim 3 at pages 3-4 of the Action, the Examiner concedes that "Stucke does not disclose the crossbar-board further comprises at least one extension crossbar-board connected at an end of said crossbar-board in a longitudinal direction."

On the other hand, the Examiner asserts that this structure is disclosed by Deboard et al. - - and further, the two references are "analogous art" because they are "from the same field of endeavor to make high density circuit boards." On that basis, the Examiner contends for the "obviousness" of the combination of the two references.

These grounds of rejections are respectfully traversed as failing to provide any *prima facie* demonstration of obviousness, since based on the bare contention that it would have been obvious to combine these references - - without identifying any motivation for that combination, as disclosed in either of the references. This is altogether defective and deficient. (MPEP 2143-2143.03).

With respect to claims 5 and 6, the Examiner stated in the Office Action that the Durston et al. reference discloses the plurality of strip panels arranged at positions corresponding to the motherboard, the strip panels crossing the crossbar-board. However, the strip panels and the

Docket No.: 1614.1143D

Serial No. 10/762,276

crossbar-board cannot be found in the disclosure of the Durston et al. reference. Thus, claims 5 and 6 clearly distinguish.

FATAL DEFICIENCY IN THE REJECTION OF CLAIM 4 SPANNING PAGES 4-5 OF THE ACTION

Pages 4-5 of the Action, claim 4 is rejected apparently on the basis of Stucke, as in relation to claim 3, but then at page 5 the Action relies on Stucke in combination with Costner and Deboard et al.

Costner is neither cited in Form PTO-892 attached the Action nor in any of the two extensive lists of citations in Forms PTO-1449 submitted by Applicants. Accordingly, the rejection must be deemed defective.

Furthermore, it is submitted that neither Durston et al. nor Deboard et al. remedy the admitted deficiencies of Stucke.

LACK OF *PRIMA FACIE* DEMONSTRATION OF OBVIOUSNESS

It respectfully submitted that the Action is devoid of any demonstration of *prima facie* obviousness of the combinations of references advanced in support of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejections at pages 3-7 of the Action.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted to have been shown in the foregoing that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the references of record, taken singularly or in any proper combination. There being no other objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Docket No.: 1614.1143D

Serial No. 10/762,276

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: January 23, 2006By: 

H.J. Staas

Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 1-23, 2006

STAAS & HALSEY

By: Date: 1-23-06